

Internationalized Domain Names Expedited Policy Development Process

Finalize P2 Final Recommendations & Next Steps



EPDP-IDNs Team Meeting #118 | 12 September 2024

Agenda

- 1. Roll Call and SOI Updates (2 mins)**
- 2. Welcome and Chair Updates (5 mins)**
- 3. Resolve Outstanding Outputs (80 mins):**
 - Grandfathered, Recs.#10-12, Rec.#14-IG#15, IG#17, Recs.#18 and #20**
- 4. Review of Proposed Table of Contents for P2 Final Report (10 mins)**
- 5. Consensus Call Process Reminder (10 mins)**
- 6. Work Plan and Next Steps (10 mins)**
- 7. AOB (3 mins)**

Resolve Outstanding Outputs

Agenda Item #3

- Grandfathered
- Recs.#10-12
- Rec.#14-IG#15, and IG#17
- Recs.#18 and #20

Outstanding Outputs

Grandfathered

No objections from the Team *(to date)*

1 The changes to be made to: exempted, excluded, exemption, exemption period

2 The overview and explanation of the new term to be included in:
1) Executive Summary (Section 1); 2) Glossary (Section 3); 3) p.2 & pp.5-6 of Final Recs. (Section 4)

3 All footnotes explaining the new term to be deleted throughout Section 4

Outstanding Outputs

Outputs #10-12 - Transfer Policy Reference

No concerns from the TPR WG:
Outputs do not conflict with the TPR WG's recommendations

Rec. #10

In the event an inter-registrar transfer process is initiated for a domain name, which is a member of a variant domain set, the process must encompass all of its allocated variant domain names, if any, together. The exempted variant domain names pursuant to [Final Recommendation 3](#) are excluded from this requirement.

Rec. #11

In the event a domain name is ordered to be transferred as a result of a Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) administrative proceeding, the transfer process must include the domain name and all of its allocated variant domain names, if any, together. The exempted variant domain names pursuant to [Final Recommendation 3](#) are excluded from this requirement.

IG #12

A Uniform Rapid Suspension System (URS) complainant is responsible for deciding whether to include allocated variant domain names, if any, of a disputed domain name as part of their URS complaint.

Outstanding Outputs

Outputs #14-15 - Registry Agreement Updates *[Update and Proposal as of 05 September]*

Rec. #14

To account for the "same entity" principle and its implications for variant domain names, gTLD registry operators should work with ICANN-accredited registrars to determine a mechanism to communicate between each other to facilitate the registration and management of variant domain names, including an indication of the source domain name(s) and initial source domain name of the variant domain set.

IG #15

In order to allow an interested party to discover the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name, ICANN-accredited registrars and gTLD registry operators should accept requests for disclosure of this information and unless there are data privacy concerns, the information should be granted. In considering whether to disclose the information, the ICANN-accredited registrars and gTLD registry operators should balance the interest of the requestor with those of the data subject, where such balancing is required by applicable law.

Outstanding Outputs

Outputs #14-15 - Registry Agreement Updates *[Initial Report Preliminary Outputs - 11 Apr. 2024]*

Rec. #14

To account for the same entity principle and its implications for variant domain names, a service must be enabled to discover the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name, including an indication of the source domain name(s) of the variant domain set. ICANN org and relevant stakeholders must consider ways to enable such a requirement. The grandfathered variant domain names pursuant to Preliminary Recommendation 3 are exempt from this requirement.

IG #15

Preliminary Recommendation 14 is intended as a minimum requirement. A registry or a registrar may choose to enhance the behavior of the service (Registration Data Directory Services [RDDS] or other alternatives) to provide additional information or enable other methods to provide the following information (e.g. bulk services):

- 15.1 if leveraging the RDDS, the required data elements for the given domain name in accordance with the Registration Data Policy;
- 15.2 all the other allocated variant domain name(s) under a given gTLD and its delegated gTLD variant label(s) if any; and
- 15.3 the source domain name used to calculate the variant domain set.

Outstanding Outputs

Public Comments Received for Outputs #14-15

The focus is on the substantive comments that relate to language evolution;
Excluded supportive comments / comments that do not relate to substantive language update

1

RySG:

- **Suggestion to revise wording for Rec. #14:**

*"To account for the same entity principle and its implications for variant domain names, **ICANN org should work with relevant stakeholders to develop and enable a service** to discover the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name, including an indication of the source domain name(s) and initial source domain name of the variant domain set. **[deletion]** The grandfathered variant domain names pursuant to Preliminary Recommendation 3 are exempt from this requirement."*

- **Delete IG #15:** No added value and objection to RDDS

"Implementation Guidance 15 does not appear to add anything that is not already stated in Recommendation 14. Its reference to RDDS seems to be an attempt to propose a solution and that particular solution has two problems. First, RDDS is a simple query-response transaction system with contractually enforced Service Level Agreements that are specific to its expected behaviour. The functionality proposed here is outside that scope of behaviour and would likely require a review of those SLAs. Second, the RDDS is a public service and there is no expected need for this proposed service to be public. Implementation Guidance 15 should be deleted for these reasons.

Outstanding Outputs

Public Comments Received for Outputs #14-15

The focus is on the substantive comments that relate to language evolution;
Excluded supportive comments / comments that do not relate to substantive language update

2

ICANN org comment on Rec. #14:

- **Request for a standardized/consistent access mechanism to retrieve/display profile**
- **Seeking clarity on ICANN org's role;** What can ICANN org do when the access to subset of allocated variants registered is only provided through the actual registration data by the registries?

“ICANN Org understands that Recommendation 14 falls solely under the responsibility of Registries, as they oversee and manage the IDN Language Table responsible for variant rule enforcement, and know what the source label is and which labels in an allocatable variant set generated by the source label are already allocated to a registrant. Despite ICANN not directly maintaining the data, without a consistent method to retrieve and display allocated labels, there may be a negative impact on ICANN org and other implementers who provide lookup tools. Therefore, the EPDP team may want to consider recommending a creation of a standardized and consistent access mechanism and display profile.”

Outstanding Outputs

Public Comments Received for Outputs #14-15

The focus is on the substantive comments that relate to language evolution;
Excluded supportive comments / comments that do not relate to substantive language update

3

NCSG comment on IG #15:

- **Objection to the expansion of RDDS**
- **Data privacy concerns**

“Whenever we are talking about RDDS and registration data, a matter of great interest for many parts of the ICANN and Internet communities, we need to be very, very clear. We understand that this recommendation sets forth the ability of the IDN Registry to expand the data elements of their Registration Data Directory Services (RDDS) as one option for indicating variant domain names. We understand that there may be other alternatives as well for this type of data, which can include the provision of additional information or the enabling of other methods, such as bulk services, to provide the following information: The required data elements for a given domain name in accordance with the Registration Data Policy; All other allocated variant domain names under a given gTLD and its delegated gTLD variant labels, if any; The source domain name used to calculate the variant domain set. We are very concerned and object to the references to the use of RDDS in any way not currently widely discussed and debated by the community on RDDS. Who would have access to this additional data and under what circumstances? If this recommendation is in any way expanding access to RDDS, we object. If not, we ask for clarification.”

Additionally, our ICANN policies must explicitly incorporate privacy and security considerations. The rationale should include a detailed discussion on the conditions that justify additional data access. This is to ensure that such access aligns with rigorous privacy standards and is equipped with safeguards to prevent data exploitation. We advocate for a transparent framework that balances operational needs with the paramount importance of user privacy and data security.”

Outstanding Outputs

Outputs #14-15 - Registry Agreement Updates [Updated Language - 08 Aug. 2024]

Rec. #14

To account for the same entity principle and its implications for variant domain names, ICANN org should work with relevant stakeholders to develop and enable a service to discover the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name, including an indication of the source domain name(s) and initial source domain name of the variant domain set. The grandfathered variant domain names pursuant to Preliminary Recommendation 3 are exempt from this requirement.

IG #15

Preliminary Recommendation 14 is intended as a minimum requirement. A registry or a registrar may choose to enhance the behavior of the service to provide additional information or enable other methods to provide the following information (e.g. bulk services):

- 15.1 the required data elements for the given domain name in accordance with the Registration Data Policy;
- 15.2 all the other allocated variant domain name(s) under a given gTLD and its delegated gTLD variant label(s) if any; and
- 15.3 the source domain name used to calculate the variant domain set.

Outstanding Outputs

Outputs #14-15 - Registry Agreement Updates

Further Comments and Developments [08~29 Aug. 2024];
Excluded supportive comments / comments that do not relate to substantive language update

1

ICANN org Legal: Caution on data privacy concerns

- Patterns or links between the domains could reveal details about the registrant's identity, activities, or personal information, unintentionally compromising their privacy; To be cautious when considering any public disclosure and to take appropriate measures to mitigate these privacy risks - restrict public access or avoid disclosure altogether, unless absolute necessity that is justified.

2

ALAC and GAC: Request for access to information

- From an end-user perspective, there has to be some "official" way to see variants, at least to verify if a label is really a variant of another. Activating variants is a choice that the registrants decide on.

3

Considering UDRP and URS

- Identification of strings as part of the variant set vs. UDRP/URS court asking for additional variants to the registries and registrars

Outstanding Outputs

Outputs #14-15 - Registry Agreement Updates [*Leadership Proposal as of 29 Aug. 2024*]

Rec. #14

To account for the "same entity" principle and its implications for variant domain names, gTLD registry operators should work with ICANN-accredited registrars to provide information on the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name, including an indication of the source domain name(s) and initial source domain name of the variant domain set. The grandfathered variant domain names pursuant to [Final Recommendation 3](#) are exempt from this requirement.

Rationale

After EPDP Team deliberations, it became apparent that two concepts were being combined in PR 14 and IG 15. Firstly, registries and registrars need a mechanism to communicate between themselves, to determine what the allocated and allocatable variant domain names are for a given domain name, for a variety of reasons, but principally, to ensure that the same entity requirement is adhered to. Secondly, an end user needs to be able to determine what the allocated variant domain names are (e.g., interest in registering a domain name or filing a URS complaint). Because of these two distinct purposes, it likely makes sense to delineate them into a separate recommendation and implementation guidance.

Outstanding Outputs

Outputs #14-15 - Registry Agreement Updates [*Leadership Proposal as of 29 Aug. 2024*]

IG #15

In order to allow an end user to discover the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name, registrars should accept and consider whether disclosure of this information should be granted. In considering whether to disclose the information, the registrar should balance the interest of the requestor with those of the data subject, where such balancing is required by applicable law.

Rationale

Support staff reached out to ICANN Legal, to determine whether there may be data privacy concerns from disclosing the allocated variant domain names of a given domain name. Though the disclosure of allocated variant domain names may not directly expose personal data, it could reveal details about the registrant that may unintentionally compromise their privacy. As such, the recommendation from legal is to restrict public access to this information or avoid disclosure altogether. However, there are reasons that an end user may need this information.

Outstanding Outputs

Outputs #14-15 - Registry Agreement Updates

Further Comments and Developments [29 Aug. ~ 05 Sep. 2024];
Excluded supportive comments / comments that do not relate to substantive language update

1

RrSG: IG #15 restriction to registries?

- Could Registries provide information too?

2

ALAC and GAC: Requesting a mechanism for access to non-private information

- *“A mechanism by which any one - including registrants, security researchers or end users - could have access to non-private information regarding the variant set.”*
- *“...should accept and consider whether disclosure of this information should be granted. In considering whether to disclose the information...”*

3

From Dennis Tan: Update for Rec. #14

- Rewording the objective of communication between the registries and registrars
- To delete the final sentence as it is irrelevant to the updated communication: *“The grandfathered variant domain names pursuant to Final Recommendation 3 are exempt from this requirement.”*

Outstanding Outputs

Outputs #14-15 - Registry Agreement Updates [*Leadership Proposal as of 05 September*]

Rec. #14

To account for the "same entity" principle and its implications for variant domain names, gTLD registry operators should work with ICANN-accredited registrars to determine a mechanism to communicate between each other to facilitate the registration and management of variant domain names, including an indication of the source domain name(s) and initial source domain name of the variant domain set.

IG #15

In order to allow an interested party to discover the allocated variant domain names for a given domain name, ICANN-accredited registrars and gTLD registry operators should accept requests for disclosure of this information and unless there are data privacy concerns, the information should be granted. In considering whether to disclose the information, the ICANN-accredited registrars and gTLD registry operators should balance the interest of the requestor with those of the data subject, where such balancing is required by applicable law.

IG #17

gTLD registry operators should publish policies, in a transparent manner, that reflect their implementation of the EPDP-IDNs Phase 2 recommendations. In particular, such policies should reflect the implementation of Final Recommendations 1, 3-6, and 14 as well as Implementation Guidance 2 and 15.

Outstanding Outputs

Recs. #18 and #20 - IDN Implementation Guidelines Updates

Rec. #18

The existing process for developing and updating the IDN Implementation Guidelines, that includes establishing a working group of community experts and ICANN org staff. under the governance of ICANN Board. must be maintained. The process for developing and updating the IDN Implementation Guidelines must be formalized and documented to enhance its predictability, transparency, rigor, efficiency, and effectiveness. The ICANN Board will be responsible for documenting the process, in consultation with the ICANN community. The documented process must be approved by the ICANN Board, in consultation with the GNSO Council and ccNSO Council.

Rec. #20

Any future versions of the IDN Implementation Guidelines must be approved by the GNSO Council prior to consideration by the ICANN Board.

Review of Proposed Table of Contents for P2 Final Report

Agenda Item #4

P2 Final Report: Proposed Table of Contents

Following the same structure and re-purposing the same templates used in the P1 Final Report and P2 Initial Report

- Section 1: Executive Summary
- Section 2: EPDP Team Approach
- Section 3: Glossary
- Section 4: Phase 2 Final Recommendations
- Section 5: Preliminary Assessment of Deferred Guidelines from IDN Implementation Guidelines Version 4.0
- Section 6: Next Steps
- Annex A: EPDP Team Charter
- Annex B: Consensus Designations
- Annex C: Responses to Phase 2 Charter Questions
- Annex D: Background
- Annex E: EPDP Team Membership and Attendance
- Annex F: Community Input

Consensus Call Process Reminder

Agenda Item #5

Process Summary and Recap

Propose Consensus Designation

After EPDP Team has deliberated on all issues, **Leadership Team to propose consensus designation** for each final recommendation:

- Full consensus
- Consensus
- Strong support but significant opposition
- Divergence
- Minority view

Initiate Consensus Call

Leadership Team to publish proposed **consensus designation** on **mailing list** for the EPDP Team to review

Member Confirmation

Members to indicate, via **mailing list**, whether they accept or do not accept the proposed designation during a 10 day period

If no objection is raised, consensus designation is considered accepted by the EPDP Team

If any objection is raised, Leadership team to reevaluate and publish an updated designation

Non-response to be taken as non-objection

Minority Statement

During a 10 day period, **Members**, as individuals or as a small group, to submit their minority viewpoints (“Minority Statements”) for recommendation that did not gain full consensus

Final Report Documentation

Staff to document the following in the Final Report as part of Annex:

- Consensus designation, as accepted by the EPDP Team
- Minority Statements

Members will NOT have their names explicitly associated with any Full Consensus or Consensus designations

Members who submit Minority Statements must have their names linked

More Information

Consensus Designation:

- **Full Consensus:** when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as Unanimous Consensus.
- **Consensus:** a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree
- **Strong Support but Significant Opposition:** a position where, while most of the group supports a recommendation, there are a significant number of those who do not support it.
- **Divergence** (also referred to as No Consensus): a position where there isn't strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view. Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinion and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that it is worth listing the issue in the report nonetheless.
- **Minority View:** refers to a proposal supported by a small number of people. This can happen in response to a Consensus, Strong support but significant opposition, and No Consensus

Additional Details:

- [EPDP Team Charter](#), **Section VI: Decision Making Methodologies**

Work Plan and Next Steps

Agenda Item #6

Work Plan and Next Steps

Date	Action
Thu, 12 Sep. (Today)	To Agree on all outstanding items and finalize all Outputs
Fri, 13 Sep.	To Stabilize the Outputs and circulate for final review
Mon, 16 Sep.	Initiate Consensus Call process on Final Outputs
Thu, 26 Sep.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Conclude Consensus Call process ● Minority Statement due, if applicable (e.g., designation of “<i>Consensus</i>” or lower for any recommendation)
Mon, 30 Sep.	Resolve challenges to consensus designations, <i>if any, no later than this date</i>
Tue, 1 Oct.	Stabilize Final Report and circulate for final review by the Team, <i>no later than this date</i>
Mon, 7 Oct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Team’s final review of Final Report, <i>no later than this date</i> ● Goal: Submit Final Draft for GNSO Council’s review
Thu, 17 Oct.	EPDP-IDNs leadership informs GNSO Council that P2 is complete
Fri, 1 Nov.	Submit P2 Final Report to GNSO Council for final consideration, <i>no later than this date</i>
Wed, 13 Nov.	Motion GNSO Council for final action

AOB

Agenda Item #7